



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,569	05/25/2001	Anthony E. Bolton	033136-185	4479

7590
Gerald F. Swiss, Esq. } 02/26/2002
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/866,569	Applicant(s) BOLTON ET AL.	
Examiner Christopher H Yaen	Art Unit 1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/25/2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 15. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-8,12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. In regards to claims 1-7, 12-15, in the recitation of the phrase "*apoptotic body and/ or apoptotic cell*" it is unclear as to the metes and bounds of these terms. The disclosure defines the terms (on page 7 line 20 of the specification), but fails to help distinguish the boundaries of this phrase and fails to distinguish the difference between the terms.

5. Claims 1-14 provides for the use of "*apoptotic bodies and or apoptotic cells*", but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it

Art Unit: 1642

merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 3-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3-14 of copending Application No. 09/866,488. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 3-14 of the instant application resemble claims 3-14 of co-pending application no. 09/866488, in that both recite the use of apoptotic bodies and/or apoptotic cells in preparative steps (see claims

3-10) in the treatment of disease types (see claims 11), and in the dosage of the medicament (see claims 12-14).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Applicant is advised that should claim 1 be found allowable, claim 15 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1, 2, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Henry F et al. (Pathobiology 1999; 67(5-6):306-10). Henry *et al.* teach the use of and production of apoptotic bodies, furthermore, Henry *et al.* teaches the isolation and successful administration of the apoptotic bodies to a mammalian patient. Henry *et al.* anticipate the claims of the instant application because the instant invention discloses the use of apoptotic bodies for the treatment of diseases associated with endothelial dysfunction. Because this term endothelial dysfunction is a broad term, which can be

associated with a large pool of diseases, cancer being one of them, Henry *et al.*
disclosure anticipated claims 1, 2 and 15 of the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 3-5, 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry *et al.*

Claims 3-5, 12-14 set forth the limitations of using apoptotic bodies in the treatment and/or prophylaxis in mammalian patients of medical disorder resulting from or involving endothelial dysfunction. Claims 3-5 limit the apoptotic bodies and/or apoptotic cells to: liquid suspensions; comprising 10%-90% of the cellular portion of the liquid suspension, further limited between 30%-70% cellular portion of the liquid suspension. Claims 12-14 limit the apoptotic bodies and/or apoptotic cells to: a dosage range comprising 10,000-10,000,000 bodies and or cells per kilogram body weight of the patient, further limited between 500,000 to 5,000,000 bodies and/or cells per kilogram body weight.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1642

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Henry *et al.* discloses the use and administration of apoptotic bodies and/or apoptotic cells in the treatment of disease (cancer). Although, Henry *et al.* does not specifically disclose the precise percentage of cellular content to be administered and/or the specific dosages of cells to administer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to use the percentage of cells and the number of cells disclosed in the instant application. It would have been obvious to do so because it was already known, through Henry *et al.*, that apoptotic bodies and/or apoptotic cells could be successfully administered and used to treat disease. The ranges disclosed in the instant application could have been achieved by one of ordinary skill in the art through routine experimentation. One would have been motivated to do so because the amount of success achieved by Henry *et al.* in treating patients would have warranted the experimentation of dosage ranges.

Conclusion

13. No claims are allowed
14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher H Yaen whose telephone number is 703-305-3586. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-

Application/Control Number: 09/866,569


Page 7

Art Unit: 1642

308-4242 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Christopher Yaen
Art Unit 1642
February 25, 2002


ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600